

NOTES ON THE GENERIC NAMES OF INDIAN THECLINÆ AND  
AMBLYPODIINÆ (*LEP. RHOP.*)

By

CAPT. N. D. RILEY, F.E.S., F.Z.S.

The following is a brief summary of notes made for my own guidance at various times, and may help to stabilise the nomenclature of this group of Indian Butterflies. It is only the older names that present any difficulty, the later authors having been more careful to fix the types of such generic names as they have proposed. I do not consider the fact that a generic name has been, for whatever length of time, employed in a wrong sense, is in any way a justification for its continued use in that sense. The sooner it is set right the better; the future of Entomology is likely to be of greater duration than its past.

I have introduced a few names which, though not now applied to the groups in question, were formerly so applied, such as *LYCÆNA*, *POLYOMMATUS*, etc., about which there has been considerable argument in the past, and also a few generic names proposed by Tutt, with which one may in the future have to reckon.

For the sake of convenience I have arranged the genera alphabetically stating in each case what I consider is the type. This is solely from the point of view of nomenclature: whether the genera are entomologically valid or justifiable or not I have not tried to decide. *T. S.* after a specific name implies that that species is the type of the genus because it was designated such by the author of the genus at the time he proposed it: *S. S.* because it was the sole species referred to the genus by the author at the time he proposed it. In all other cases the reasons for designating any particular species as the type are given.

ACESINA,	Moore.	Journ. As. Soc.	1884.	<i>T. S. paraganesa</i> , de N.
AMBLYPODIA,	Horsf.	Cat. Lep. E. I. C.	1829.	<i>paidanus</i> , Cramer.

Horsfield introduced the generic name *Amblypodia* for a number of species which he divided into five subsections, viz., (1) *narada*, (2) *vivarna*, (3) *apidanus*, *centaurus*, *helus*, *eumolphus*, (4) *phocides*, (5) *vulcanus*, *lohita*, *syama*, *timoleon*, *jalandra*, *longinus*, *erylus*, *jangala*, *vidura*, *etolus*, representing in fact many genera.\*

Doubleday (List Brit. Mus., p. 23, 1847) employs it for a number of those species enumerated by Horsfield, and others.

Westwood (Gen. Diurn. Lep. p. 477, 1852), employs it in a similar sense, but also expressly states that "the types of the genus" are the large Indian *Amb. centaurus*, *apidanus*, *helus*, *anthelus*, etc., thus limiting the possible type of the genus to one of the first three of those species, since *anthelus* is not mentioned by Horsfield. The type was finally specified by Scudder (Hist. Gen. Butt. p. 108, 1875) as *apidanus*, which must be accepted.

It is unfortunate that, following Boisduval (1870), authors should consistently have ignored the earlier workers and taken *narada* as the type. Obviously, in view of Westwood's restriction, it could not be the type under any circumstances.

APHNÆOMORPHA,	deN.	Butt. Ind. III, p.	1890.	<i>T. S. orcas</i> , Drury.
APHNÆUS,	Hübner.	Verz. bek. Schmett.	1822-3.	<i>orcus</i> , Drury.

Hübner gives only two species, *vulcanus* and *orcus*. No action was taken by any author in any way to affect the case till Scudder (Hist. Gen. Butt. p. 116, 1875) selected *orcus* as the type. This he was perfectly at liberty to do, and his

\* He also states (p. 111 l. c.) that he considers "the species of the third section to be typical of the genus." See also Riley. Entom., 1922, p. 25.

action must be upheld. *Aphnæomorpha* must fall as an absolute synonym to *Aphnæus* in consequence.

APPORASA,	Moore.	Journ. As. Soc.	1884.	S. S.	<i>atkinsoni</i> , Hew.
ARAOTES,	Doh.	Journ. As. Soc.	1889.	S. S.	<i>lapithis</i> , Moore.
ARHOPALA,	Boisd.	Voy. Astrol. p. 75.	1832.	S. S.	<i>helius</i> Cram. ( <i>phryxus</i> , Boisd.)

ARTIPE,	Boisd.	Lep. Guat. p. 14.	1870.	T. S.	<i>eryx</i> , Linn. ( <i>amyn- tor</i> , Her- bst.)
---------	--------	-------------------	-------	-------	---

Scudder (l. c. p. 121) states that the name must fall because it is preoccupied by *Artipus* (Schonh. Col. 1826). The similarity between the two names does not seem sufficiently close to warrant this, and I consider the name should be upheld, if it is required.

ARRHENOTHRIX,	deN.	Butt. Ind. III, p. 337.	1890.	T. S.	<i>penicilligera</i> , de N.
AUROTIS,	Dalm.	Vetensk. Akad. Handl. XXXVII, p. 63.	1816.		<i>betulae</i> , Linn.

Although the type is not actually specified by Dalman it is most unmistakably indicated as *betulae*. Falls to *Thecla* and *Zephyrus* (q. v.).

BASPA,	Moore.	Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. p. 250.	1882.	S. S.	<i>melampus</i> , Cramer.
BIDASPA,	Moore.	Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. p. 250.	1882.	T. S.	<i>nissa</i> , Koll.
BIDUANDA,	Dist.	Rhop. Malay. p. 237	1884.	T. S.	<i>thesmia</i> , Hew.
BINDAHARA,	Moore.	Lep. Ceylon, I. p. III.	1884.	S. S.	<i>phocides</i> , Fab.
BITHYS,	Hübner.	Zutr. Ex. Schmett. p. 18.	1818.	S. S.	<i>leucophæus</i> , Hubn.

In his Verz. bek. Schmett. p. 75 Hübner adds other species, and gives a reference to his Zutrage for the description of *leucophæus*. This shows p. 75 of the Verzeichniss appeared after p. 18 of the Zutrage; in fact it does not seem to have been published till 1822-3.

BRITOMARTIS,	deN.	Journ. Bom. N. H. S. p. 305.	1896.	T. S.	<i>cleoboides</i> Elw. and deN.
BULLIS,	deN.	Journ. As. Soc. Beng. p. 559.	1897.	T. S.	<i>buto</i> , deN. (♂ nec. ♀)
CALLOPHRYS,	Billb.	Enum. Ins. p. 80.	1820.		<i>rubi</i> , Linn.

Billberg only mentions *vulcanus*, *rubi* and a MS species. *Rubi* was specified as the type by Scudder (l. c. p. 132).

As there seems to be some disagreement as to whether Billberg's list 'Enumeratio Insectorum in Museo Gust. Joh. Billberg' should be accepted or not, it may be as well to examine briefly the arguments for or against it.

Firstly it is said that it is merely a list of the specimens in the author's own collection. Certainly it is; but the fact that the author, in the Rhopalocera alone, proposes over 40 new generic names is clear evidence that he did not intend it to be a 'mere list'. Further, he gives brief diagnostic characters for all the larger divisions down to groups of genera.

He does not give any generic diagnosis; but the species (except the MS ones)

which he refers to his new genera are all at once recognisable from the localities and the authors' names which in all cases he gives. It has been said elsewhere (Wals. and Durr., E. M. M. p. 167, 1902) that "it is a concession to the older authors that we accept a named but undescribed genus if its types are recognisable". This seems to be a case in point.

It is then further argued that we cannot be certain that Billberg correctly identified his species, and therefore we cannot accept his generic names, as we do not know whether the species he founded them on are the species he refers to. But this appears to be going a bit too far; one must give him the benefit of the doubt at any rate. If we allowed this argument to stand Billberg is not the only author by a very long way whose work would have to be rejected.

CAMENA, Hew. III. Diurn. Lep. II, 1865. S. S. *ctesia*, Hew. p. 47.

The genus is, however, pre-occupied by CAMCENA, Baly (Col. 1862), and must be dropped.

CATAPÆCILMA,	Butl.	Trans. Linn. Soc. Zool. p. 547.	1877.	S. S.	<i>elegans</i> , Druce.
CHÆTOPROCTA,	deN.	Butt. Ind. III, p. 311.	1890.	S. S.	<i>odata</i> , Hew.
CHARANA,	deN.	Butt. Ind. III. p. 401.	1890.	T. S.	<i>mandarinus</i> , Hew.
CHERITRA,	Moore.	Lep. Ceylon, p. 109.	1881.	T. S.	<i>freija</i> , Fab. ( <i>jafra</i> ).
CHERITRELLA,	deN.	Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. p. 456.	1887.	S. S.	<i>truncipennis</i> , deN.
CHLIARIA,	Moore.	Journ. As. Soc. Beng. p. 32.	1884.	T. S.	<i>othona</i> , Hew.
CHRYSOPHANUS,	Hübner.	Zutrage Ex. Schmett. p. 24.	1818.	S. S.	<i>mopsus</i> , Hübner.

For some strange reason Hübner later (Verz. bek. Schmett. p. 72, 1822) removed *mopsus* from *Chrysophanus* to *Strymon* (q. v.) replacing it by a number of other species which he had not originally included in the genus at all.

CHRYSOPTERA, Zinck. Allg. Lit. Zeit. (Jena.) 1817. *virgaureæ* Linn. III, p. 75.

The name was proposed by Zincken for Ochsenheimer's 'family VIII (B)' which was the coppers, etc. The type was specified by Tutt (Ent. Rec. XVIII, p. 131, 1906).

CIGARITIS,	Donz.	Ann. Ent. Soc. France, 2, V, p. 528.	1847.	S. S.	<i>zohra</i> , Donz.
COPHANTA,	Moore.	Journ. As. Soc. Beng. p. 35.	1884.	T. S.	<i>illurgis</i> , Hew.
COREANA,	Tutt.	Brit. Lep. IX, p. 276.	1908.	T. S.	<i>raphælis</i> , Oberth.
CREON.	deN.	Journ. Bomb. N. H. S. p. 181.	1896.	T. S.	<i>cleobis</i> , Godt.
CREUSA,	deN.	Journ. Bomb. N. H. S. p. 176.	1896.	T. S.	<i>culta</i> , deN.
CUPIDO,	Schranck.	Fauna Boica, II, I, p. 153, 206,	1801.		<i>minima</i> , Fuess. ( <i>alsus</i> ).

The type was fixed by Kirby (Journ. Linn. Soc. Zool. X, p. 499, 1870) as *minimæ*. As no action had been taken by any other author in the meantime, Kirby's action must be upheld.

CYANIRIODES, deN. Butt. Ind. III, p. 33 1890. S. S. *andersoni*, Moore.

DACALANA,	Moore.	Journ. As. Soc.	1884.	T. S.	<i>vidura</i> ,
		Beng. p. 36.			Horsf.
DARASANA,	Moore.	Journ. As. Soc.	1884.	T. S.	<i>perimuta</i> ,
		Beng. p. 42.			Moore.
DERAMAS,	Dist.	Ann. Mag. Nat.	1886.	S. S.	<i>livens</i> ,
		Hist. 5, XVII, p.			Dist.
		252.			
DEUDORIX,	Hew.	III. Diurn. Lep. I,	1863.	T. S.	<i>epijarbas</i> ,
		p. 16.			Moore.
DIPSAS,	Doubl.	List. Lep. B. M.	1847.		<i>syla</i> , Koll.
		p. 25.			( <i>pholus</i> ).

The genus as first used by Doubleday contained only two species, both MS. It was adopted and described by Westwood (Gen. Diurn. Lep. II, p. 479, 1847) who also specified as the type *syla*, Koll. of which the MS. species *pholus* Doubl. is given as a synonym.

The name must however be dropped being pre-occupied in Reptiles (Lam., 1768) and Molluses (Leach, 1814).

DRINA,	deN.	Butt. Ind. III,	1890.	T. S.	<i>donina</i> ,
		p. 442.			Hew.
DRUPADIA,	Moore.	Journ. As. Soc.	1884.	T. S.	<i>ravindra</i> ,
		Beng. p. 31.			Horsf.
EOOXYLIDES,	deN.	Butt. Ind. III, p.	1890.	T. S.	<i>tharis</i> ,
		432.			Hübner.
EUASPA,	Moore.	Journ. As. Soc. Ben	1884.	S. S.	<i>milionia</i> ,
		Beng. p. 29.			Hew.
FLOS,	Doh.	Journ. As. Soc.	1889.	T. S.	<i>apidanus</i> ,
		Beng. p. 412, 423,			Cram.

Falls to *Amblypodia*, of which it is an absolute synonym.

HELIOPHORUS,	Geyer.	Hübner's Zutrage	1832.	S. S.	<i>epicles</i> ,
		IV, p. 40.			Godt.

Geyer gives only *helennus*, which is a synonym of *epicles*.

HEODES,	Dalm.	Vetensk, Akad.	1816.		<i>virgaureæ</i> ,
		Handl. XXXVII,			Linn.
		p. 63, 91.			

The name is proposed by Dalman as a subgenus of his own *Zephyrus*. At p. 91 he enumerates seven species without specifying any type, but previously on p. 63 in a generic synopsis he clearly indicated that he considered *virgaureæ* a typical species. This should therefore be taken as the type, as stated by Tutt. (Brit. Lep. VIII, p. 313), in spite of Scudder's ill-advised action (l. c. p. 187) in suggesting *phleas* as the type.

HESPERIA,	Fab.	Ent. Syst. III (1),	1793.		<i>malvæ</i> ,
		p. 258.			Linn.

Fabricius originally included in this genus some 350 species, including both *Lycanidæ* and *Hesperidæ*, among them *malvæ*. The type was fixed by Cuvier (Table Element, p. 592, 1798), who gives a diagnosis of the genus and cites *malvæ* as the only example.

HORAGA,	Moore.	Lep. Ceylon, I. p. 98	1881.	T. S.	<i>onyx</i> ,
					Moore.
HYPOCHRYSOPS,	Feld.	Reise Nov. p. 251.	1865.		<i>anactetus</i> ,
					Feld.

Felder included a number of species in the genus originally. The type was fixed by Scudder (l. c. p. 194) as *anactetus*.

HYPOLYCÆNA,	Feld.	Wien. Ent. Monats.	1862.		<i>tharrytas</i> ,
		p. 293.			Feld.

Scudder specifies *sipylus* as the type, regarding *sipylus* and *tharrytas* as the same species. This seems doubtful. Since Felder does not mention *sipylus* in

his original description of the genus, *tharrytas* should be taken as the type.

HYSUDRA,	Moore.	Proc. Zool. Soc.	1882.	S. S.	<i>selira</i> ,
		Lond.	p. 250.		Moore.
ILERDA,	Doubl.	List Lep. B. M. II,	1847.	S. S.	<i>epicles</i> ,
		p. 25.			Godt.

Doubleday does actually mention some other species, but, as he only gives them MS names, they must be disregarded.

Falls to *Heliophorus*, of which it is an absolute synonym.

INDOXYLIDES,	Doh.	Journ. As. Soc.	1889.	(nom. nud.)
		Beng.	p. 410.	

Doherty states that the name was proposed by him for *Eooxylides* (which, incidentally, was not published till the following year by deNiceville), but he gives no types nor description and himself sinks it to *Eooxylides*. Doherty's proposal of the name *Indoxylides* appears to have been contained in, and confined to a letter to deNiceville. The name must be regarded as an absolute synonym of *Eooxylides*.

IOIS,	Doh.	Journ. As. Soc.	1889.	(nom. nud.)
		Beng.	p. 411.	

The only species mentioned by Doherty in connection with this name is "an *Arhopala*, apparently *inornata*, Felder", and then follow some few words about the egg. This is altogether insufficient to establish *Iois* as a valid generic name; it should be treated as a synonym, of *Amblypodia*.

IOLAUS,	Hübner.	Verz. bek. Schmett.	1822-3	S. S.	<i>eurisus</i> ,
		p. 81.			Cram.

Hübner also gives *helius*, Fab., which is a synonym of *eurisus*.

IRAOTA,	Moore.	Lep. Ceylon p. 101,	1881.	S. S.	<i>timoleon</i> ,
					Stoll
					( <i>mæce-</i>
					<i>nas</i> , Fab.)
JACOONA,	Dist.	Rhop. Malay. p. 233	1884.	T. S.	<i>anasuja</i> ,
					Feld.

JALMENUS,	Hübner.	Zutr. Ex. Schmett.	1818.	S. S.	<i>evagoras</i> ,
		p. 29.			Don.

Later (Verz. bek. Schmett. p. 75, 1822-3) Hübner added *venulius* and gave a reference to his earlier use of *Jalmenus* in the Zutrage.

JAPONICA,	Tutt.	Brit. Lep. IX, p. 277	1908.	T. S.	<i>scpestria-</i>
					<i>ta</i> , Hew.
LEHERA,	Moore.	Proc. Zool. Soc.	1883.	T. S.	<i>eryx</i> , Linn.
		Lond.	p. 528.		

Falls to *Artipe* (q. v.).

LICUS,	Hübner.	Zutr. Ex. Schmett.	1822.	S. S.	<i>niphon</i> ,
		2nd hundred, p. 7.			Hübner.

The name is pre-occupied in Coleoptera (Fab. 1787).

LISTERIA	deN.	Journ. As. Soc.	1894.	T. S.	<i>dudgeoni</i> ,
		Beng. p. 35.			deN.
LOXURA,	Horsf.	Cat. Lep. E. I. C.	1829.		<i>atymnus</i> ,
		p. 119.			Cram.

*L. atymnus* and *pita* are given. From the context the former was obviously considered by Horsfield the more typical, and has been accepted as the type, quite correctly.

LYCUS,	Hübner.	Verz. bek. Schmett.	1822-3	
		p. 74.		

A misspelling for *Licus*, Hübner, q. v.

MAHATHALA,	Moore.	Proc. Zool. Soc.	1878.	S. S.	<i>ameria</i> ,
		Lond. p. 703			Hew.

MANECA,	deN.	Butt. Ind. III, p. 1890.	T. S.	<i>bhotea</i> , Moore.
MANTO,	deN.	Journ. Bomb. N. H. 1895. S. p. 312.	T. S.	<i>hypoleuca</i> , Hew.
MARMESSUS,	Hübner.	Verz. bek. Schmett. 1822-3 p. 81.		<i>lisias</i> , Fab.

Four names were given by Hübner under *Marmessus*, *alcides*, *corax*, *atymnus* and *lisias*. The type was specified by Scudder (l. c. p. 212) as *lisias*. This he was perfectly free to do as no author had taken any action in any way to affect the case. DeNiceville appears to have been aware of this but failed to adopt it.

MARSHALLIA,	Doherty.	Journ. As. Soc. 1889. Beng. p. 410.		(nom. nud)
-------------	----------	--	--	------------

No description is given by Doherty, nor does he attribute any species to the genus. He states that he proposed the name (? in litt.) for *Eooxylides* (deNiceville 1890) but that it was pre-occupied (Spongida; Zittel, 1877).

The name must be regarded as an absolute synonym of *Eooxylides*.

MASSACA,	Dobson.	Journ. As. Soc. 1889. Beng. p. 411, 417 429.	T. S.	<i>pediade</i> , Hew.
MOTA,	deN.	Butt. Ind. III, p. 1890.	T. S.	<i>massyla</i> , Hew.
MYRINA,	Hübner.	Illiger's Mag. VI, p. 286.	1807.	<i>silenus</i> , Fab. ( <i>alcides</i> , Cr.).

Hübner only mentioned two species, *silenus* and *helius*. The type was fixed by Oken in 1815 (Lehrb. d. Naturg. I, p. 722) who used the name for eight species, only specifying two by name, one of which was *silenus*. This was confirmed by the action of Westwood (1852) and Kirby (1870), the latter specifying *silenus* as the type.

NADISEPA,	Moore.	Proc. Zool. Soc. 1882. Lond. p. 249.	S. S.	<i>jarbas</i> , Fab.
NARATHURA,	Moore.	Proc. Zool. Soc. 1878. Lond. p. 835.	T. S.	<i>hypomeuta</i> , Hew.
NEOCHERITRA,	Dist.	Rhop. Malay. p. 252 1885.	S. S.	<i>amrita</i> , Feld.
NEOLYCÆNA,	deN.	Butt. Ind. III, p. 65 1890.	T. S.	<i>sinensis</i> , Alph.
NEOMYRINA,	Dist.	Rhop. Malay. p. 234 1885.	T. S.	<i>himalis</i> , G. & S.
NILASERA,	Moore.	Lep. Ceylon I, p. 114.	1881.	T. S. <i>centaurus</i> , Fab.
OPS,	deN.	Journ. Bomb. N. H. 1895. S. p. 296.	T. S.	<i>ogyges</i> , deN.
OXYLIDES,	Hübner.	Verz. bek. Schmett. 1822-3 p. 77.		<i>faunus</i> , Drury.

Hübner set up the genus for *celmus* and *faunus*. The type was specified by Scudder (l. c. p. 234) as *faunus*.

PANCHALA,	Moore.	Proc. Zool. Soc. 1882. Lond. p. 251.	T. S.	<i>ganesa</i> , Moore.
POLYOMMATUS,	Latr.	Nouv. Dict. d'Hist. Nat. XXIV, p. 184, 200.	1804.	S. S. <i>icarus</i> , Rott, ( <i>argus</i> ).
PRATAPA,	Moore.	Lep. Ceylon, I, p. 108.	1881.	T. S. <i>deva</i> , Moore.

PSEUDOCHLIARIA,	Tytler.	Journ. Bomb. N. H. 1915.	T. S.	<i>virgoides</i> ,
		S. p. 139,		Tyt.
PSEUDOLYCÆNA,	Wallgn.	K. Vett. Akad. Vorh. 1858.	T. S.	<i>marsyas</i> ,
		XV, p. 80.		Linn.
PSEUDOMYRINA,	H. H.	Druce. Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. p. 606.	T. S.	<i>martina</i> ,
PURLISA,	Dist.	Rhop. Malay. p. 234 1884.	T. S.	<i>giganteus</i> ,
				Dist.
RAPALA,	Moore.	Lep. Ceylon, I, p. 105.	T. S.	<i>varuna</i> ,
				Horsf.
RATHINDA,	Moore.	Lep. Ceylon, I, p. 99 1881.	T. S.	<i>amor</i> , Fab.
REMELANA,	Moore.	Journ. As. Soc. Beng. p. 37.	T. S.	<i>jangala</i> ,
				Horsf.
RITRA,	deN.	Butt. Ind. III, p. 411.	T. S.	<i>aurea</i> ,
				Druce.
RUMICIA,	Tutt.	Ent. Rec. XVIII, p. 131.	T. S.	<i>phlœas</i> ,
				Linn.
RURALIS,	Tutt.	Ent. Rec. XVII, p. 212, 1905 ; XVIII, p. 130, 132, 1906 ; Brit. Lep. VIII, p. 313.	T. S.	<i>betulæ</i> ,
				Linn.

Tutt brings forward this Linnaean name stating that it was "heterotypical in its use by Linnæus" but that Barbut in *Les Genres des Insectes de Linné (1781)* "specifies *betulæ* as the type".

Actually all Barbut did was to give one example of each of the Linnaean divisions of *Papilio*, describing it and figuring it, but always referring to it in the full quadrinomial system of Linnæus. When dealing with *betulæ* he calls it *P. P. Ruralis betulæ*, and it comes immediately under the heading PLEBEIL. This cannot be considered as a binomial application of the word *Ruralis*, and hence Barbut's application of the name can no more be accepted as justification for its employment as a valid generic name from that date than can Linnæus' own use of the term. If *Ruralis* is to be accepted as a valid generic name on the strength of Barbut's action, then *Candidus*, *Phaleratus*, etc., must also be accepted, as they were considered of equal rank as subdivisions of *Papilio* in the early days. The only sane course with these names appears to be to neglect them entirely until someone employs them in accordance with the strict rules of binomial nomenclature.

*Ruralis* should therefore be attributed to Tutt, who first uses it binomially, the type being specified by him as *betulæ*. The name therefore falls to *Thecla* and *Zephyrus* (q. v.)

SATADRA,	Moore.	Journ. As. Soc. Beng. p. 38.	T. S.	<i>atrar</i> ,
				Hew.
SATSUMA,	Murray.	Ent. Mo. Mag. XI, p. 168,	T. S.	<i>ferrea</i> ,
				Butler.
SEMANGA,	Dist.	Rhop. Malay. p. 233 1884.	T. S.	<i>superba</i> ,
				Druce.
SINTHUSA,	Moore.	Journ. As. Soc. Beng. p. 33.	T. S.	<i>nasaka</i> ,
				Horsf.
SITHON,	Hübner.	Verz. bek. Schmett. p. 77.		<i>nedymond</i> ,
				Cram.

The name was employed by Hübner for *nedymond* and *melampus*. The type was virtually fixed by Kirby (Syn. Cat. p. 411, 1871) as the former species, which was specified by Scudder (*l.c.* p. 269) as the type.

- SPINDASIS, — Wallgn. Rhop. Caffr. p. 45. 1857. S. S. *natalensis*,  
Dbl. &  
Hew.  
(*masili-*  
*kasi*).
- STRYMON, Hübner. Zutrage Ex. Schmett 1818. S. S. *melinus*,  
p. 22. Hübner.
- The date of Hübner's use of the name in his Verz. bek. Schmett, p. 74, is apparently much later, about 1822-3.
- SUASA, deN. Butt. Ind. III, p. 1890. T. S. *lisides*,  
386. Hew.
- SURENDRA, Moore. Proc. Zool. Soc. 1878. S. S. *quercetorum*,  
Lond. p. 835. Moore.
- TAJURIA, Moore. Lep. Ceylon, I, p. 1881. T. S. *cippus*,  
108. Fab.  
(*longi-*  
*nus*).
- THADUKA, Moore, Proc. Zool. Soc. 1878. S. S. *multicauda*,  
Lond. p. 836. Moore.
- THAMALA, Moore. Proc. Zool. Soc. 1878. S. S. *miniata*,  
Lond. p. 834. Moore.
- THECLA, Fab. Illiger's Mag. VI, 1807. *betule*,  
p. 286. Linn.
- Fabricius set up the genus for *betulæ, spini* and *quercus*. Swainson (Zool. Ill. I, 2, p. 69, 1821-2) specified *betulæ* as the type. This action was perfectly consistent with the treatment of the genus by previous authors and was confirmed by the action of Curtis (1829) and Westwood (1840), Scudder (*l. c.* p. 280) specified *spini* as the type, labouring under the fallacy that because *Zephyrus* had been set up by Dalman in 1816 with *betulæ* as the type, that species was no longer available. This fallacy runs throughout, and sadly spoils his otherwise excellent work on the Genera of Butterflies. *Betule* must be taken as the type.
- TICHERRA, DeN. Proc. Zool. Soc. 1887. T. S. *acte*, Moore.  
Lond. p. 457.
- USSURIANA, Tutt. Brit. Lep. IX. p. 1908. T. S. *michaelis*,  
276. Oberth.
- UTICA, Hew. Ill. Diurn. Lep. 1865. S. S. *onycha*,  
p. 56. Hew.
- Unfortunately pre-occupied in Crustacea, 1847.
- VADEBRA, Moore. Proc. Zool. Soc. 1883. T. S. *petosiris*,  
Lond. p. 528. Hew.
- VIRACHOLA, Moore. Lep. Ceylon, I, p. 1881. T. S. *perse*, Hew.  
104.
- YASODA, Doh. Journ. As. Soc. 1889. *pita*, Horsf.  
Beng. p. 410.
- Doherty did not refer any species to the genus although he gave a brief diagnosis of it. Dé Niceville adopted it from Doherty in his Butterflies of India, III, p. 438 (1890) and specified *pita* as the type.
- ZELTUS, deN. Butt. Ind. III, p. 1890. T. S. *etolus*, Fab.  
399.
- ZEPHYRIUS, Billb. Enum. Ins. p. 80. 1820.
- A misspelling of *Zephyrus*, of which it is an absolute synonym.
- ZEPHYRUS, Dalman. Vetensk. Akad. 1816. T. S. *betulæ*.  
Handl. XXXVII, Linn.  
p. 62.



